

Remarks/ Arguments

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph. Claim 8 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-9 and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

Claim 8 has been amended so that it depends from claim 1, and also has been amended to include additional elements for clarification purposes.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 9-10, 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gemma in view of Cabrera.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references to Gemma or Cabrera to arrive at the invention as claimed in amended claim 1.

For example, Gemma discloses a book that includes a puppet device which can be in the form of a finger puppet or glove. However, this reference does not even hint at the use of a connecting element in the form of a line or string connecting the puppet or glove to a book. Instead, the device of Gemma is much more complicated with additional puppets that may be attached to the glove element, rather than being formed integral with this glove element as disclosed with the present invention in claim 1. Gemma would not have any need for a line connecting the puppet to a book because Gemma is formed from a plurality of different components that are not necessarily connected to the book. In addition, Gemma with its design

as shown in FIG. 2 indicates that this device can be separated into different pieces. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the device disclosed in Gemma would not suggest using a line or connecting element shown in Cabrera.

Alternatively, Cabrera does not disclose the following feature claimed in claim 1:

...wherein said ~~puppet~~ at least one glove can be stored in said container and wherein said puppets ~~is~~ are in the form of at least one finger puppet...

Cabrera relates not to a glove containing multiple finger puppets that can be stored inside of a container but rather to a stocking that can be coupled to a book wherein the book can be stored inside of the stocking. This stocking shown does not reveal the use of finger puppets. In addition, as shown in FIGS. 1 and 2 of Cabrera, the book is stored inside of the stocking rather than a glove being stored inside of a compartment on a book.

Under MPEP rule 2143.1, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)

Thus, this rule states that if the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious. In re Ratti, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959). It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is patentable over the combination of Gemma and Cabrera because Gemma was designed to be a device which has a plurality of detachable elements while Cabrera was designed to be a stocking which can be used to store a book. Both of these original designs would have to be modified extensively such that they are used for a different purpose and with a different principle of operation before it would be obvious in view of amended claim 1. With the present invention, the glove can be stored inside of the book via a container. Cabrera et al, teaches the opposite, while Gemma et al does not disclose a glove that can be coupled to a book via a string or a line.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solomon '521 in view of Baum '209.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Solomon does not disclose puppets coupled to a glove. With Solomon, there are a plurality of different puppets with none of the puppets being connected to each other. These puppets cannot be stored inside of a single container because they are all disconnected from each other. Baum does not disclose the glove coupled to a book. There is no suggestion to combine these two references together. Baum does not disclose a book or a container with a book either.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is patentable over the

above cited references taken either singly or in combination. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-21 which ultimately depend from claim 1 are patentable as well.

Early allowance of the remaining claims is respectfully requested.

A prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COLLARD ET AL :

  
Allison C. Collard  
William C. Collard  
Edward R. Freedman

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.  
1077 Northern Boulevard  
Roslyn, New York 11576  
(516) 365-9802

Attorneys for Applicant

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile transmission to the U.S.P.T.O. to Patent Examiner Suhol, D at Group No.3714 , to 1-571-873-5300 on December 6, 2005 .  
response.wpd

